Claims 1-14, 17-23 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over Buckley et al. Claims 15, 16 and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Buckley et al and one or other of Kupka et al, Osada et al and Lin et al.

The independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 29 have been amended to emphasize distinctions over Buckley as below.

Buckley et al discloses a general purpose computer 100 (see FIG. 2) which generates print data employing a plurality of printer drivers (col 7, line 33) stored in the printer driver memory portion 134 of the computer memory 130. Buckley et al discloses that the rendering options to be used to render a particular document are selected by the user (col 2, lines 42 and 44, 52) through an input device 150 by selecting a virtual printer appropriate to the desired rendering options (see col 2, lines 40-45). The user interface (see FIG. 1) disclosed by Buckley et al is rendered by the general purpose computer 100 to a display device 160. The general purpose computer 100 (see FIG. 2) is not a printer nor is it a print server. The general purpose computer 100 is distinct from the printer 310 and print server 200 (col 6 line 1-4). Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest that the printer 310 or the print server 200 or the display device 160 renders documents with different sets of rendering parameters.

Buckley et al suggests that if content to be rendered is composed of several distinct image objects (graphics, text and photographic images, for example) or document types, the user may select a set of rendering options provided by the user interface (see FIG. 1) contained in a printer driver (see FIG. 2, 134) stored in memory portion (136, 138, 130) of the general purpose computer 100, the set of rendering options being associated with different virtual printers (col 2, lines 39-42) and thus being device dependent. As an example, the described UI for the multiple printer drivers must first be installed in the general purpose computer 100. Applicant's FIG. 1A (prior art) corresponds broadly to the disclosure of Buckley et al. The information apparatus of the applicant corresponds broadly to Buckley et al's disclosure of a general purpose computer 100.

Note that applicant describes a printer controller in the prior art section of this application (FIG. 1B and element 180 and 190, parag 20-24). The prior art described with reference to FIG. 1B is

11

distinct from FIG. 1A and is not combinable with FIG. 1A. Buckley et al does not describe a printer controller, and a prior art printer controller (FIG. 1B, 180, 190) cannot be combined with Buckley et al. As described with reference to applicant's FIG. 1A (Parag 17-18), Buckley et al does not require a printer controller to process the document. The document is processed in the general purpose computer or the information apparatus, not in a printer controller. In contrast, (in FIG. 1B, 180, 190 and Parag 20-24) the printer controller in an output device rasterizes and/or renders the document. Combining the prior art printer controller (FIG. 1B) with Buckley et al leads to unproductive design and redundancies that would not be adopted by one skilled in the field of printing and it does not correspond to the disclosure of the output controller method by the applicant. In any event, forcing the combination of Buckley et al (or prior art FIG. 1A) with a prior art printer controller (FIG. 1B, 180, 190) produces a copier machine (see Buckley et al Col 6 line 4-9). Buckley et al describes that integrating the general purpose computer 100, the printer 300 and the display device 160 produce a single stand alone copier machine to which the integrated parts are non distinct.

Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest a method of sending an output device profile or output device attributes over a communication channel between the general computer and the printer 300 or the print server 200. Buckley et al does not describe sending an intermediate output data from the general purpose computer 100 over a communication channel to a controller or output device, the intermediate output data conformed at least partly based on the output device profile or attributes of the output device received. In Buckley et al the print data generated from the UI as part of a printer driver accordingly is specific to a specifically user selected virtual printer or virtual printer model previously installed.

Buckley et al discloses that the printer driver "converts the currently opened document into printer data and printer control commands and outputs the printer data and printer control commands..to the currently selected meta printer 300 or 310." See column 7, lines 13-20. Thus, Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest that the general purpose computer 100 supplies intermediate output data that is conformed at least partly with an output device profile received from the printer server 200 or printer 300, 310 nor that any component of

the printer server 200 or printer 300, 310 receives intermediate output data or sends an output device profile.

In accordance with applicant's invention, the intermediate output data is received at the controller from the information apparatus, the controller being distinct from the information apparatus. It is important to note that the output device profile (claims 1 and 9) or attribute related to the output device (claim 17) is not previously stored or installed in the information apparatus. Unlike Buckley et al, the output device profile or attribute is sent from the controller. The conforming of the intermediate output data is based on an output device attribute or profile received over the communication channel, not based on user input selection.

Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest that the general purpose computer 100 or the disclosed UI (FIG. 3, 4, 5, 6) discovers an output device over a local area network. It is important to note that in Buckley et al, each virtual printer or its associated printer model is pre-installed, and stored in the general purpose computer. They are not obtained or retrieved from the local area network or from a controller or from an output device. Furthermore, in Buckley et al the selection step of the printer model that contains the parameters is based on user input and selection. It is not based on or related to discovered output devices.

In view of the above background information, the independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 29 have been amended to emphasize that the controller and the output device are distinct devices from the information apparatus.

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to emphasize that the controller, distinct from the information apparatus, provides an output device profile to the information apparatus over the communication channel. The intermediate output data conformed at least partly to the output device profile, is received from the information apparatus and not based on user input selection as in Buckley et al.

Independent claim 17 has been amended to add software for posting or broadcasting wirelessly the availability of the output device so that the output device can be discovered by the one or more information apparatus.

Referring to the rejection of dependent claims 15 and 25, Kupka et al describes a method of distribution of content over a network

13

infrastructure to which a client user 20 can access content in
e-commerce server 16 over the Internet/WLAN using prepaid media
tracking server 16 for processing payment. Kupka et al does not
disclose or suggest that the prepaid media can be deducted for payment
as a service for data output (e.g. printing) other than for accessing
content over the internet. Moreover, referring to FIG. 1 of Kupka et
al, the server 16 is connected to WLAN/Internet 12, and the client PC
20 is first connected to the local area network 14 and then connected
to the WLAN/Internet 12. The media tracking server 16 connected to
the WLAN/Internet 12 tracks usage of content access for processing
payment. Claims 15 and 25 have been amended to emphasize that the
communication channel between the information apparatus and the
controller is a short range wireless communication channel and not a
WLAN/Internet as in Kupka et al. The client PC 20 and server 16 in
Kupka et al cannot be combined with the general purpose computer 100
of Buckley et al for payment. Client PC 20 does not deduct payments.
In any manner, the media tracking server 16 of Kupka et al is
connected to WLAN/Internet 12 and is not connected directly to Client
PC 20 through a local area network 14.

    Referring to the rejection of dependent claim 16 and 26, Osada et
al describes a printer controller that manages print jobs and print
data. Osada et al cannot be combined with Buckley et al. The general
purpose computer 100 of Buckley et al is not a printer controller and
the print server 200 does not send parameters/attributes related to
the output device over the communication channel.

    Referring to the rejection of dependent claims 24, 27 and 28, Lin
et al (FIG. 2) describes a method to simulate a selected driver by the
user in a local host computer (col 2, 38-43) in which the actual
driver is not installed. The user must first specify from the local
host computer or information apparatus (col 2, line 55-61) the
location of the remote output device (col 4, line 24-30) so that a
query with security control can be performed. Claims 27 and 28 have
been amended to emphasize that the security control or the query is at
the controller, which is distinct from the information apparatus.
Combining the general purpose computer 100 of Buckley et al and the
local host computer of Lin et al (col 2, line 55-61), both being a
client information apparatus, can only produce another client and not
a controller that is distinct from the information apparatus.

Moreover, the general purpose computer 100 of Buckley et al requires a printer driver to be pre-installed, and in Lin et al, the local host computer does not have a printer driver installed. The two methods are distinct and it would be clear to one skilled in the art of printer drivers that the two cannot be combined. Isolating and extracting one single step from Lin et al's method having multiple steps (FIG. 2), and inserting into the method of Buckley et al would not create a method that can function as or corresponds to applicant's method.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the invention as defined in the independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 29 is not disclosed or suggested by Buckley et al, Accordingly, claims 1, 9, 17, and 29 are patentable and it follows that the dependent claims also are patentable. Moreover, the features of amended dependent claims 15, 25, 16, 26 27 and 28 are not disclosed or suggested by Buckley et al, Kupka et al, Osada et al and Lin et al, whether taken singly or in combination. Accordingly, claims 15, 25, 16, 26 27 and 28 are patentable independently of the respective base claims.

Respectfully submitted,

John Smith-Hill
Reg. No. 27,730

SMITH-HILL & BEDELL, P.C.
16100 N.W. Cornell Road, Suite 220
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

Tel. (503) 574-3100
Fax (503) 574-3197
Docket: FLEX 2233